The Official Organ of The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 4. Vol. I.] LONDON, DECEMBER, 1904. [Monthly, One Penny

THE COMPETITION OF WOMEN.

—:o:—

Every little while a cry goes up that women are displacing men in some industry or another, and the terror-stricken males affected, rave wildly about the duties of women and the "rights" of men, while the dear old platitudes about the "proper sphere of women" are trotted out. On the other hand there are enthusiastic feminists who rave as wildly about woman's "rights" and the utter selfishness of men, and who assert anarchistically that no restrictions whatever should be placed on female labour, and who virtually claim the right of woman to "blackleg" male labour if necessary. The advocates of each side, their intellectual vision bounded by the capitalist system, see nothing in the future but the gain of men at the expense of women, or the employment of women to the detriment of men. How superficial are such views and how utterly futile are the measures proposed, may be gathered from a brief review of this vexed question.

The fact that women are entering more and more into industrial pursuits is too patent to be disputed. In trade after trade the fact is noted. Here it is the clerks, there the textile workers, and here again it is the cycle machinists. During the half-century 1841 to 1891 the number of males engaged in the principal manufactures has increased by 53 per cent., whereas the number of females employed has increased by no less than 221 per cent. The influx of cheap labour into already overcrowded industries cannot fail to intensify the already acute distress due to the lack of employment.

The reasons for this increase of female labour are not far to seek. The precariousness of employment for males renders marriage less desirable, forces fathers to send their daughters, and husbands their wives, out to work to supplement the family earnings, while on the part of the women there is at the same time a growing necessity to find something other than marriage as a means of subsistence.

The steady increase of power-driven machinery renders strength less essential in industry, while the displacement of handicraft by the machine makes it possible to employ a lower grade of labour than formerly; therefore the employers, eager as ever to obtain the cheapest labour that is profitable, make use of the thrifty and industrious womanhood of the country for their purpose.

Here, as elsewhere, the law of wages is seen, and since women can live more cheaply than men, they get less in wages. Nay, since women and girls are in many cases partly kept by the males of the families, and are often only sent to work to obtain dress or pocket money until marriage, it requires a still smaller contribution from the employer towards their keep; and they, of course, usually get it. Women's wages are thus depressed, and men give a portion of their wages to subsidise competitors on the labour market.

During the past few years the decline in average wages and increase in cost of living has been particularly noticeable, whilst the unemployed have grown more numerous than ever. The displacement of men by machines, the development of machine industries in countries which were once markets for the produce of this country, all tend to decrease the effective demand for products while productive powers increase at an ever faster rate. The foreign trade is going by the board, whilst the home market is severely stricken owing to the decreasing purchasing power of the masses and the competition of other centres of production. This must mean, it is clear, great "over-production," bankruptcies, stagnation of trade and unemployment, even without the additional factor of a greater over-supply of labour by reason of the employment of women. Indeed, the future of capitalism is seen to be full of dark clouds by even the most optimistic of men.

What, then, should be the policy of those who have the welfare of women truly at heart? By some "woman's righters" the abolition of all restrictions upon the employment of women is advocated as a solution of the question as far as women are concerned. It is obvious that this means neither more nor less than the right to "blackleg" male labour, since under existing conditions to become employed at all women must work cheaper than men. This must not only increase the unemployed by displacing men, but it will render it less possible for men to support families than hitherto, thus forcing more and more wives and daughters into competition with husbands, brothers, and each other. To flood the already overcrowded labour market in this way is to make employment more difficult to find even at wages that will barely suffice for one, not to speak of a family. This surely is no solution. Others, again, advocate the severe restriction of woman's labour, or the prohibition of female employment except at wages equal to that obtained by male labour of similar quality. Even were it possible to bring this about under capitalist rule, it would be worse than useless, for the following reasons: Owing to custom and prejudice, employers would in most instances rather employ a man than a woman, other things being equal, and women would hardly be employed at all, because they would be no cheaper than men. This would inflict great hardship on those numerous women who must earn their own living, while machinery and the competition of other centres would soon make the men worse off than ever. This again is no remedy.

What, then, is the solution? To find this we must go a little deeper into the problem than we have yet gone. It should be evident that, within limits, the employment of women should vastly increase the national wealth owing to the great increase in labouring power that is made accessible to society. Yet at present, we know that it would mean greater misery to the wealth-producers. The same is true of all the improved methods of wealth production. The greater efficiency of labour, the improved organisation of industry, the increase of labour-saving machinery should, it would seem, vastly increase the wealth and decrease the toil of the people. At present, however, the contrary is true, and every year sees an intensification of competition, and every machine swells the ranks of the unemployed.

If the increase in the nation's wealth does not at present benefit the wealth producers; if the increase of willing workers and labour-saving machinery serves only to make heavier the burden of the worker, we have to ask an explanation of such an anomalous state of things. The explanation is indeed easily grasped. When the producers own the means of production and raw material they will reap the benefit of every improvement: but if the means of producing wealth are the property of a handful of individuals who use them as a means of profit only, then the greater the skill and number of propertyless workers, the fiercer will competition be between them, and the greater the portion of their produce they will tacitly be compelled to bid to the owners of the machinery of production in return for permission to earn a living. Since men cannot obtain a livelihood without having access to land and machinery, the owners of these wield supreme power over the non-possessors: and the propertyless in competition are compelled to forego, under the forms of rent, interest, and profit, practically the whole of what remains after the cost of maintenance of the worker and his family has been deducted from his total product. This, then, is the broad fact, obscure to most people by reason of the complexity of modern society, but at the bottom undeniable. It engenders the antagonism of interests between exploiter and exploited that is the basis of the modern war of classes.

If, therefore, the anomalous state of things which makes an increase in wealth-producing power spell a decrease in the well-being of the worker, is due to the divorce of the producers from the means of production, and the ownership of the latter by a parasitic class: the remedy is obviously not the reduction of society's producing power, but evidently the ownership of the productive and distributive machinery by the producers of wealth, and an end of class parasitism. In short, the disease is inherent in Capitalism and can be cured only by Socialism. Quack "remedies" which touch symptoms only are useless, the root cause must be abolished or the disease will grow worse.

We now see the only way with women's labour. Neither permission to women to "blackleg" nor their relegation to the harem is of the slightest use. So long as the system of capitalist production endures, so long must toil and trouble increase for the workers, both men and women. The only hope for both is in Socialism, for then only will wealth producers benefit by a plethora of wealth, and labour-saving devices mean a lightening of toil. It is now both impossible and undesirable to go back to, that dream of the poet, the middle ages, when each man owned his simple means of producing wealth. The mighty modern machine is a social instrument, ownership of which imparts almost absolute power. Too huge to be owned individually by the worker, the machine must be owned socially, and the workers can only throw off the yoke of wage-slavery and become their own masters by collectively assuming control of the machinery of industry and using it in the interests of the wealth producers.

The destinies of men and women are bound up together, and the emancipation of women can only come with the emancipation of men. Socialism is the only hope of the whole working-class irrespective of sex, and The Socialist Party of Great Britain is the only party that stands for undiluted Socialism.—F. C. W.

Let no man fear the name of "Socialist." The movement of the working-class for justice by any other name would be as terrible.

Father William Barry.

THE SURVIVAL OF THE UNFIT.

IS SOCIALISM THE GOSPEL OF THE UNFIT?

Twenty years ago the principles of Socialism were certainly most imperfectly understood by the mass of the people, but the recent article in the *Daily Mail* entitled "The Gospel of the Unfit" shows also that a large number of educated men are still ignorant of its simplest elements. Mr. Percival Gibbon, confused no doubt by the fact that every philanthropist and "labour leader" or [illegible] who expresses sympathy with the poor and oppressed, is dubbed a Socialist, has hardly grappled the "pure principle of Socialism" of which he writes. He is undoubtedly correct in his assumption that the Cause has attracted to its ranks many would-be politicians who find therein an outlet for their own personal ambitions, and who, obtaining a following, use the power thus obtained for their own ends. This is a parasitic growth common to all great movements; and in all countries it has been recognised by the Socialist parties as unavoidable. Meanwhile the Revisionists and "labour leaders" are being vigourously attacked; the Liberal, who tries to conceal his identity under a cloak of Socialism, is like the ass in the lion's skin, and betrays himself when he begins to bray.

The false idea of Socialism is still further increased by the action of that Press which sees Socialism in every measure touching the working-class. Even the late Labour Ministry in Australia was described as "Socialist," despite the absence from the Senate and House of Representatives of a single Socialist member.

It is admitted that these misleading statements have rivetted the attention of the public on self-seeking individuals, to the neglect of the "pure principle of Socialism." This, too, Mr. Gibbon finds "noxious and hostile to the natural tendency of the human race to growth in all directions," for "by opposing the law of the survival of the fittest it rallies the unfit to its side."

This statement is the portion of Mr. Gibbon's article which needs serious consideration. Now, if this hostility to Nature be really present, the scientists—and there are many—who support Socialism must be in a somewhat difficult position, for it is on scientific grounds that the Socialist bases his principles, and it is from the Theory of Evolution that he draws his conclusions; in fact the Theory of Evolution forms the bed-rock of his Economics and Philosophy. How then can his Socialism be in opposition to the natural tendencies of the human race? The mistake, only too often made, is due to a narrow interpretation of the Darwinian theory.

The word "fittest" is made to apply always to the individual instead of to the community or species. The "fittest" then, in the modern state of "civilised society," is the cunningest, even though physically and morally rotten; that is to say, the big financier, the swindler, etc! No doubt such folk are the fittest under the present conditions, but let the present conditions be altered, and the fittest to survive will be a totally different being. And the present conditions must alter, for modern competition between man and man is largely a hot-house product, forced on by artificial means, and unfitted to survive long in the open field of Nature.

Further, this suicidal struggle does not eliminate, but creates, the "unfit" and "unemployable." Strenuous competition is apt to throw out the capable and fit as well as to increase the degradation and misery of the "unfit" by heredity. It must be remembered also that it is from the section of the "unfit" that Socialism draws none of its recruits, while it is from the loafer and parasite at both ends of the social scale that the Movement meets with most of its opposition. On the other hand, it is from the more intellectual and capable of the citizen class that Socialism receives its chief support.

What then is this "Gospel of the Unfit," and at what system of Society does it aim? It demands, broadly speaking, a Society in which social production shall be for social use. This involves the forming of the Co-operative Commonwealth. The questions to be considered are, therefore, whether co-operation on a large scale is in accordance with the Law of Evolution, and whether it will [illegible] the advance, intellectual, physical and moral, of the human race.

The Theory of Evolution as put forward by Darwin, still remains the clearest conception of the origin and development of the various organic kingdoms, but it must not be forgotten that his theories were largely [illegible] by two important forces, namely, the desire to prove that man had evolved, and the teaching of Malthus. These two considerations led him to adhere, for the most part, to a theory of evolution into which he had not the time fully to enquire.

This factor was the Law of [illegible] which perhaps played a more important part in the development of species than any law of struggle or competition. Most of Darwin's followers have, however, been too narrow-minded to follow out a train of thought often suggested in his works. In the third chapter of "The Origin of Species" he says, "I should premise that I use the term 'Struggle for Existence' in in a large and metaphorical sense, including dependence of one being on another, and including (which is more important) not only the life of the individual but success in leaving progeny."

We find too, in "The Descent of Man," that "those communities which included the greatest number of the most sympathetic members would flourish best," and he points out further that co-operation leads to the highest development of the intellect and morality needful for the survival of the species.

If we examine carefully this "dependence of one being on another" and "the success in leaving progeny," we find that the former results in the latter, and that co-operation regularly takes place during the breeding season for the sake of protection against a common enemy—the combination of several species of birds to attack a bird of prey is one of the commonest sights in nature. This same "dependence of one being on another" results in the highest development of the individual, for we find that individual intelligence and activity are conspicuous wherever the members of a species co-operate.

Among insects none are of higher intellect than the bees, ants, and termites. Their great works—their roads, their storehouses, are all marvels of workmanship, and each member of the community is capable of performing any part of the necessary work. Nor is any greater or less than another: an ant that refuses to help with food a fellow ant in need of it is killed.

Among birds, none are of greater intelligence than the parrots and cranes, who always live in communities and practise mutual help.

Among mammals there are few that do not associate with their species. The happy lives of the members of the marmot communities, and the wonderful powers of the beaver are notable examples of the development attained through co-operation.

We find, too, that the monkeys, which show the highest development of all mammals, except man, live almost wholly in societies. Finally, among primitive men, savages, and barbarians, communism was the rule, and it is undoubtedly to this that we owe the high development of the human race.

So then, the "survival of the fittest" does not imply mutual competition, which leads to the destruction and weakening of the species, but rather mutual help. This, however, can only be properly practised in a Society where social production is for social use instead of for individual profit; and where the individual, freed from the degrading and destructive struggle for the means of existence, may have time and space to fully develope his own individuality without depriving the other members of his species of the necessaries of life. For Socialism by no means aims at reducing all men to the same dead level—a sheer impossibility—but rather seeks the development of a Society in which Nature, with her laws of natural selection, may have perfect freedom from all artificiality, and in which the mutual law shall be, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

SYDNEY CHASE.

THE rich are always content with the lot of the poor.—WERTHEIMER.

SOCIALISM IN COVENTRY.

SOCIALISM in this city is of the sort which one would naturally expect to find where its professors fail to recognise its basic principle. To this fact we may attribute the lack of proper enthusiasm, and want of adequate financial support which were conspicuous features of the Clarion Sunday Lectures held last winter.

All the alleged Labour and so-called Socialist parties here have identified themselves, time and again, with one of the capitalist parties—the Liberals.

Some two years ago when Dr. Clifford brought his nonconformist conscience to Coventry, and spoke in the Corn Exchange to the kind-hearted Liberals on the monstrosities of the wicked-hearted Tories, the *Independent* Labour Party had its representative on the platform. Is Dr. Clifford in favour of, or will the Liberal Party grant, that Secular Education which the I.L.P. and other professedly Socialist bodies demand? We know they will not. Then why this coquetting? Is such a policy calculated to make converts to the Cause from amongst Conservatives who see professedly independent Socialists hobnobbing with their natural enemies, the Liberals?

The Liberal element was much in evidence during the Clarion Lectures referred to. Liberal members of the Town Council took the chair on more than one occasion, and I heard Mr. H. R. Farren express the hope that the Mayor (a Liberal) would see his way to preside at some future date. Yet only a few weeks ago this same mayor bluntly informed a deputation convened by the Trades Council on behalf of the unemployed, that "the general feeling of the Council was antagonistic to the Trades Council, and communications sent by the latter body *were invariably treated with contempt.*"

As a result of this unemployed conference, work was found by the Town Council for 90 men of the thousands standing idle. *Vai victis!*

"See yonder poor o'erlabour'd wight,
So abject, mean, and vile,
Who begs a brother of the earth
To give him leave to toil;
And see his lordly fellow worm
The poor petition spurn,
Unmindful tho' a weeping wife
And helpless offspring mourn."

So the capitalist-class flouts the claims of the worker and the only way for Socialists to checkmate them and effectually combat the evil tendencies which are the natural outcome of Bourgeois domination is by the maintenance of complete independence and of uncompromising opposition to both wings of the capitalist party.

Complete independence must be the watchword of all Socialists, otherwise we cannot wonder at Conservatives regarding us as little more than a wing of the Liberal Party.

JAMES HUTCHESON.

CALL ye that a society, where there is no longer any social idea extant? not so much as the idea of a common home, but only of a common over-crowded lodging house, where each, isolated, regardless of his neighbour, clutches what he can get, and cries "mine!" and calls it Peace, because, in the cut-purse and cut-throat scramble, no steel knives, but only a far cunninger sort, can be employed.

T. CARLYLE. (Sarter Resartus.)

WITH the seizing of the means of production by society, production of commodities is done away with, and, simultaneously, the mastery of the product over the producer. Anarchy in social production is replaced by systematic, definite organisation. The struggle for individual existence disappears. Then, for the first time, man, in a certain sense, is finally marked off from the rest of the animal kingdom, and emerges from mere animal conditions of existence into really human ones. The whole sphere of the conditions which environ man, and which have hitherto ruled man, now comes under the dominion and control of man, who now, for the first time, becomes the real conscious lord of Nature, because he has now become master of his own social organisation. . . . It is the ascent of man from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom."—FREDERICK ENGELS.

KARL MARX.

—:o:—

It has been said by the cynic that each man considers himself, and each woman considers her husband, the greatest of men. Be that as it may, it is not to the man whose influence over a few is the greatest, but to him through whom has been exerted the most far-reaching influence for good over the greatest number of the world's inhabitants and through whom the progress of man's happiness has most largely been caused, that must be accorded the premier position in the estimation of mankind.

I am not a believer in the "great man" theory which attributes historical events and social changes to the genius, courage, and enterprise of this individual or that, but hold rather the view that the development of society in accordance with natural law through a never-ending cancatenation of cause and effect, action and reaction of forces, has always produced at the required juncture, instruments in the shape of men for further progress.

It is always difficult to apportion to any one man the share due to him of any great movement or thought or invention, inasmuch as he takes advantage of the work done by the many who have gone before. Nevertheless, it is always interesting to survey the proportions and gaze on the personality of the men with whose names have been associated movements and ideas which have to any appreciable extent influenced the thoughts and actions of any considerable section of the human race.

I think, however, it is not to the man of science in the laboratory, not to the man of letters in the library, not to the inventor in the workshop that we have to look so much as to the social investigator and teacher, the world teacher who, through the science of society and universal philosophy, has shown how best the laboratory and literature and invention can be applied for the advantage of the race. If we judge then by this standard and look among the philosophers we shall find but one teacher whose influence has been manifested in the founding of a school of social thought which is world-wide. That teacher is Karl Marx.

Marx is known less in this country than he is on the Continent, but even here are to be found a goodly number of people clear in the perception of the truths unveiled by Marx, and more than that, the philosophy, the religion and the political ideas of those who are opposed to him are leavened by his views. In England as in America, in Australasia as in Japan, in South America as in South Africa, and everywhere in Europe do we find men with common aims, common hopes, and common ideals, building on the doctrines formulated by Marx a practical constructive policy for the banishment of the social ills from which men suffer, for the laying of a satisfactory basis of human life in the establishment of a society which shall provide adequately for man's material needs, and through his material well-being secure a healthier intellectual and moral character for the race.

What, then, was the teaching of Marx? His main position is to be found in his *Das Kapital* in which he discusses the economy of capitalist society, tracing its origin and development and foretelling its ultimate end. His main theses were that all rent, interest and profit find their source in the unpaid labour of the working-class; that from free competition monopoly must necessarily arise, large capitals being able to crush small capitals and absorb them, while these large capitals grew larger in the hands of individual owner, limited liability company, combine, trust; that through the introduction of machinery and the consequent production of machinery by machinery, human labour is displaced and an industrial reserve of unemployed is necessarily established; that this same machinery more and more specialises man's effort till man becomes a routine worker carrying on monotonous detail operations; and that arising from the industrial anarchy in society as regards both production and distribution is the poverty and consequent misery of the wage-working population.

Far more wide-reaching than all these however, is his materialistic conception of history, and his claim that all history has been a history of class struggles which will last until the lowest class, the class of the workers, gains political control and uses the power its members thereby gain to abolish all classes by abolishing the basis of class society, *i.e.*, private property in the means of living. The materialist conception of history, as understood by Marx, is not necessarily associated with a belief in scientific or physiological materialism—that all phenomena can be explained in terms of molecules or atoms or any lower form of matter into which molecules or atoms can be resolved. Marx's theory is that the economic modes of production and of distribution in any society are, in the main, the governing factors upon which the social structure, religion, political and juridical relations of that society depend. If this theory be sound then it follows that any change in any of the existing relations of man to man must be preceded by a change in industrial methods, and that any change in industrial methods is reflected in the social phenomena of society.

That Marx was not only a great thinker but a great leader of men can be disputed by no one who has examined the political strength of Socialism. A man who, in indicating the mainspring of social development, has laid the foundation stone of that mighty international movement with its millions of adherents; must have been equipped with more than ordinary vision. And to those who believe that the future of society must follow the lines laid down by him, it reasonably appears that the name of Karl Marx will for all time be associated with the most momentous social transformation heretofore witnessed in history. He who in the midst of a poverty-stricken exile laid down the principles guiding a world-wide movement destined to shape the society of the future must be hailed by friend and foe as one of the world's greatest, and by Socialists as the greatest, measured by his influence for the betterment of the lives of men and the regeneration of society.

R. ELRICK.

SOCIALISTS AND LIBERALS.

MR. WILL THORNE'S VIEW.

The "Stratford Express" publishes the following letter:—

"November 11th, 1904.

"Dear Sir,—In reply to yours, with reference to attending at Mr. Crooks' meeting to-night, I think it will be impossible for me to attend, as I have to attend a joint meeting at the Bricklayers' Hall, Southwark, in connection with the sections engaged in the building trade.

"I should like to point out that by the compact made by the Liberal and Radical members of the West Ham Town Council with the Tories with a view of defeating the ends of the Labour Party, it has made it almost impossible for the advanced workers in the borough to render any assistance to the Liberal and Radical candidate for the north side of the borough. No doubt some of these gentlemen will say that the Socialist and Labour Party made a compact with the members of the Council in 1898.

"But I should like to point out that the compact we made was with the Liberals and Radicals and Irish Nationalists. Many members of the Liberal and Radical Party have been urging a compact between Liberalism and Labour, but it has never been suggested or thought of by the Socialists and Labour members with the Tories. You will, therefore, see that there is a great deal of difference between the compact made in 1898 and the agreement made between the Liberals and Tories of the West Ham Town Council for the election of Mr. Byford as Mayor, and for filling up the vacant aldermanic seats.

"If this thing is going to continue, then it seems to me that the gulf which exists between Liberalism and Labour will become very much wider. I trust that you will have a very successful meeting. I was thinking of writing a letter to the Press about the compact made by the Liberals and Radicals and the Tory members on the West Ham Town Council.

"Yours truly,

"W. THORNE.

"Mr. W. Wadley,

"68, Hampton-road, Forest Gate, E."

PARTY NOTES.

—:o:—

DURING the present month there will be two meetings of the E.C., viz., Saturday, December 3rd, 3 p.m. and Tuesday, December 20th, 7 p.m. These meetings will be held at the Communist Club, and any member, by presenting his membership card, is entitled to be present during the transaction of the business.

* * *

The practice, initiated by our Provisional Executive, of throwing the Sessions of the E.C. open to the members, is now a rule of the Party and is giving every satisfaction, not only to the members who, residing in London, have the opportunity of attending, but also to those living in provincial centres. A short time ago I received from a member in the midlands a letter from which I quote the following:

* * *

"I am exceedingly well pleased with the tone of our paper. It has the genuine ring about it. I was especially interested in and greatly pleased with your report at the General Meeting. The policy pursued, as indicated in your report, is the very essence of Democracy. No Tammany Hall here! Let everything be done openly and above board. *That* is Socialism."

* * *

Largely owing to the efforts of our Edmonton and Wood Green comrades, there is every likelihood of a Branch of the Party being soon established in Tottenham, where our comrades have been conducting a successful out-door propaganda. Last Sunday two of our speakers held a meeting at West Green Road at which the names of several new members were obtained. Two persons (not members of the Party) moved a vote of confidence in our organisation which was carried without dissent by the audience.

* * *

Our Islington comrades are active, and have not the slightest intention of being excelled by Paddington or any other Branch. They have obtained, since my last "Notes" appeared, more new members and are again at the same rate of increase as Paddington. Of course, mere numbers is not all that is required.

* * *

But in addition to keeping well abreast as far as Branch membership is concerned, the Islington Branch has shewn the lead in the nnmber of prepaid subscriptions obtained for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD. Comrade Sator, alone, has sent in eight Annual Subscriptions and is no doubt looking for more. Here is an example that could with advantage be emulated by many more of our members.

* * *

The sale of the Party Organ will, of course, not be so large during the next two or three months as it has been during the open-air propaganda season. But any possible diminution of income from sales can be to a certain extent compensated for by an increase in the Annual Subscriptions. Now is the time to secure them.

* * *

In Battersea the Sunday Night Lectures at Sydney Hall are being continued. I have not yet received the Syllabus for December, but am in a position to announce two subjects. On Sunday, 4th December, C. Lehane will speak on "Ireland, To-day and To-morrow," and on Sunday, 11th Dec., J. Fitzgerald will lecture on "Reform or Revolution." Time, 7 p.m.

* * *

Rumours are afloat that several of our members have quitted the Party and gone back to the S.D.F. This is not so. I am not aware of a single case where this has occurred. But we can readily understand that in circulating the rumour the wish is father to the thought.

C. LEHANE.

OBSTINACY of opinion and heat in argument are surest proofs of folly. Is there anything so assured, resolute, disdainful, contemplative, serious, and grave as an ass? MONTAIGNE.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

To facilitate the transaction of the business of the Editorial and Management Committee, appointed by the Executive Committee of The Socialist Party of Great Britain to conduct its official Organ, members of the Party and other readers are particularly requested to address all literary communications to the *Editorial Committee, 5, Avenue Road, Highbury, N.*, and all business correspondence, including Subscriptions and Advertisements, to *A. Anderson, 24, Belmont Avenue, Edmonton, N.*

(Signed) C. LEHANE, *Secretary*,
Editorial and Management Committee.

Terms of Subscriptions.

	£	s.	d.
Twelve Months	0	1	6

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

	£	s.	d.
Per Inch, One Insertion	0	2	6
Quarter Column do.	0	5	6
Half Column do.	0	10	0
One Column do.	1	0	0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard,

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1904.

SOCIALIST UNITY.

One of the most important questions raised at the International Socialist Congress at Amsterdam was that of Socialist Unity. This is by no means the first time that consideration has been given to this subject. It has often been felt by many of those who have taken part in Socialist propaganda and Socialist organisation that much harm was done by the existence in this and other countries of rival Socialist organisations. And those who have thus felt have been anxious to find some means of unifying the Socialist parties in each country. The International Congress has on the present occasion contented itself with passing a pious resolution recommending the various groups in any country to use their best endeavours to secure this end.

We confess that we are not sanguine that anything will be done. And we are by no means certain that if anything could be done that such thing would be desirable. We are all for unity. We believe that unity of party organisation based upon unity of purpose, unity of principle, and unity of method is the one thing desirable. But to-day we are only too sure that such unity of party organisation, so far as the various groups of Socialists in any country are concerned, would be at the expense of unity of purpose, principle, and method.

In the field of Socialist thought and Socialist action there are to-day two distinct tendencies to be found: the revolutionary and the revisionist. At one time the main trend of Socialist development was essentially revolutionary, but to-day the Socialist movement has been overtaken by a wave of revisionism.

In every country where there is anything in the nature of a Socialist party we have a struggle for supremacy between these two opposing tendencies. And these tendencies manifest themselves in opposing groups. The differences existing in France between Jaures and Guesde and their respective parties are not isolated cases. In Italy we have the parties of Ferri and Turati; in Germany we have the Bernsteinianers; in Belgium the Socialists are almost purely revisionist; in America and elsewhere we have similar dissensions.

In this country we find the same forces, the same influences at work. There are in England —in addition to The Socialist Party of Great Britain—three organisations closely identified with Socialism, viz., The Fabian Society, The Social-Democratic Federation, and The Independent Labour Party. Of these four organisations the three latter are revisionist, the former is revolutionary. Hence while there exists no apparent reason—except the jealousy of the individual members—why the three revisionist bodies should not unite, The Socialist Party, taking its stand on the class struggle, which The Fabian Society and The Independent Labour Party in their writings, and The Social-Democratic Federation by their actions deny, is fundamentally opposed to these other parties.

Unity is an important factor in the growth of a party, but it is not the most important. Better far to have a party, however small, with common principles and a common end, than a party, however large, which is bound by no tie save party interest. We, therefore, who differ from these other parties in essential principles—inasmuch as we accept the principle of the class struggle while they do not—cannot consent to unite our forces with theirs. It would weaken both parties—and the weakening would be more disastrous to the uncompromising section than to the revisionist.

But, it may be objected, does not at least the Social-Democratic Federation accept the principle of the class struggle? Judging from their writings one would imagine that they did. But judging from their actions they do not. And when a party pretends to believe something which their actions belie, the most charitable construction to put upon the matter is that they are avowing their belief in principles which they do not really understand. Their allegiance is but lip-allegiance.

The latest action of the Social-Democratic Federation is proof conclusive that they have little faith in the principle of the class struggle. In the columns of "Justice" recently, the claim was put forward that the Social-Democratic Federation controlled a million votes in the United Kingdom—an average voting strength, that is, of nearly 1,500 in each constituency. The absurdity of this claim is shown by the fact, first, that the total strength of their organisation does not exceed, if we judge by their subscription list, 1,500 in all or two in each constituency, and, second, that in those constituencies in which their voting strength is the greatest, as shown by their being selected for contest, their vote has ever failed to reach this number of 1,500. If in selected constituences they cannot secure this number, how much less can they secure it on the average in all the constituencies?

Why do they raise this absurd claim? Is it not that they have ceased to be a purely Socialist party and are going in for mere reform? In the first number of The Socialist Standard we expressed our opinion that they had become a reform party seeking only to secure free maintenance of the children and of the payment of members. Now, what is their position if he affirms that the Liberal Party are in favour of these two principles? They are morally bound to throw the million votes they say they control on the Liberal side: they are morally bound to give their utmost support to the Liberal Party. Hence their million votes! And the Liberal Party, knowing that the million votes are but the figment of the Quelchian imagination, treat their communications with studied contempt.

The Fabian Society is a collection of middle-class men who cannot possibly, if the class war theory be correct, believe in that class war. They think the best method of furthering what they understand to be Socialism is to join other political parties—Tory or Liberal—and educate them from within. And with *their* type of Socialism they may be perfectly right. But the Socialism of the Fabian Society is not the Socialism of the class struggle, not the Socialism of the Dresden resolution, not the Socialism of anti-revisionism. Their Socialism is a commercial type—the Socialism of the merchant, of the market: as mongrel a breed as the Manchester brand of philosophic radicalism.

The methods of the Independent Labour Party are such as might be expected of a party which was avowedly the child of political cowardice. "We find" said the founders of that organisation, "we find that many people dislike the *name* of Socialism and, therefore, we must start a party with Socialist principles but without the name." Since its initiation it has held unswerving and uncompromising faith in the principle of compromise. And now it has entered into an unholy alliance with the Labour Representation Committee and is already quarrelling with the other organisations represented therein as to who should have the dominant voice in the administration of that wing of the Liberal Party.

We cannot see, therefore, how we can secure unity by joining hands with these organisations. They are carrying out a policy with which we cannot agree, and we, and with us the Socialist movement of this country, of which we claim to be the truest representatives, would be hindered for a space. We are all for unity, but it is for a unity firmly established on a common aim, and a common method. Any other unity is but a delusion.

We shall continue then to carry on our work of propaganda and organisation in our own way, trusting that our party will gain the support of all those in this country who are desirous of achieving unity, and that as time goes by our present party nucleus will widen until such time as its strength will have rendered it in reality as in name the worthy political expression of the whole of the Socialist movement in Great Britain.

We, for the present, think that a unification of Socialist forces in this country is neither possible nor desirable. As the years go by our work will bear good fruit and we shall grow in numbers until the accomplishment of Socialism shall have rendered our party unnecessary. Its only remembrance will then be in the hearts and minds of a happy and contented people—the children of The Socialist Republic.

The really exhausting and really repulsive labours instead of being better paid they are almost invariably the worst paid of all . . The more revolting the occupation the more certain it is to receive the minimum of remuneration.

JOHN S. MILL.

In every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organisation necessarily following from it, forms the basis upon which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch. Consequently the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes. The history of these class struggles form a series of evolution in which, now-a-days, a stage has been reached where the exploited and oppressed class—the proletariat—cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class—the bourgeoisie—without at the same time, and once and for all emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class-distinctions and class-struggles.—MARX.

The receipt of this paper is an invitation to subscribe.

A LOOK ROUND.

Those nose-poking busybodies who constitute the Charity Organisation Society have recently employed themselves enquiring into the question of other people's unemployment and have issued an exhaustive report on the matter. They have discovered that pauperism and vagrancy are increasing continuously and that there is a large, unskilled, unorganised mass, many of whom are unemployable, if that word can be taken to mean that they have come to dislike long periods of continuous labour, and are often, in bodily strength and temperament, unfit for it.

* * *

At first sight this looked as if the C.O.S. were indulging in the prevailing fashion and attacking the "smart set," but as probably some of the Society belong to that set they would hardly cry "stinking fish." The report contains a number of recommendations which may be summed up in more committees, more classification, better organisation of charity and a further enquiry and report. And if all these recommendations are adopted the unemployed problem will be untouched because the cause of the unemployment lies deeper than these people have ever poked. When it is solved by the only way, a reorganisation of our industrial system, well-fed unemployed like the members of the C.O.S. will find circumstances somewhat altered.

* * *

Charity, whether organised or unorganised, exists because some folk have more than they need and others need more than they have. In a country where labour applied to natural objects can produce more than sufficient for everybody, such a state is unnecessary as well as unjust. In the Socialist Society, where industry is organised for the benefit of all, where all perform their share of the necessary labour and where all enjoy without stint the results of the organised effort of the whole community, neither want nor charity need to exist. But the perpetuation of the capitalist system and not the establishment of the Socialist Society is the object of the charity-mongers.

* * *

In a note appended to the report George Lansbury, who was a member of the Committee of Enquiry, dissents from it, mainly on questions of principle, such as the reasons which have led to increased pauperism in places like Poplar and West Ham. He agrees with what is said as a statement of reasons which have operated to accentuate the evil, but does not agree that we have created the evil. He is of opinion that this lies far deeper in our individual life than any question of Poor-Law administration. This is veering round with a vengeance, for a man who has been a Socialist Parliamentary candidate and thus has publicly associated himself with the materialist philosophy.

* * *

Much attention is being given just now to the Poplar Labour Colony at Laindon, Essex, which is claimed by its promoters to most nearly approach to a solution of the unemployed problem. The colony consists of some hundred acres of land which were presented to the Poplar Guardians at a peppercorn rent for an experimental period of three years by Mr. Fels, with the option of buying it at the price he paid, viz., £2,125. Work has been going on for three months, during which time two reservoirs have been constructed and are almost ready for use, living quarters have been erected, and nearly the whole of the farm colony prepared for cultivation. When it is added that the colonist, *of course*, is not supposed to make a resting place of the farm, but will, when sufficiently trained in agricultural duties, be passed on to some other employer, where he will be able to make a fresh start in life, it will easily be recognised how far from the solution the experiment is.

* * *

From the point of view of those of the submerged who are taken from the gutter and taught to become competent agricultural workers some good is done, but as soon as they become such they enter into competition with other workers, and if they are to secure employment it can only be by driving others, less competent perhaps, into the gutter to require treatment by the Guardians in the same manner. Obviously such a scheme provides no solution of the problem—it merely raises one section of the community at the expense of another.

* * *

In dealing with this problem last month, attention was drawn to the effect of the introduction of machinery, involving a greater and greater output with the aid of fewer men. Machines are introduced to effect a saving, usually in the wages bill. Last month's number of the "Decorator" published a description of the paint-dipping plant recently installed at Woolwich Arsenal. Ammunition and other waggons are dipped bodily into tanks containing paint, which is kept agitated by means of revolving screws, and may be given three coats in one day, as the paint dries very quickly. The saving effected is very great and is likely to be extended to other industries.

* * *

The Liberals have every reason to be satisfied with the good work which W. Crooks is doing for them, and they must laugh in their sleeves when they recollect that he is paid £200 a year by the L.R.C. to represent "Independent" Labour. Last month he presided at a bazaar organised by the Boro' of Woolwich Labour Representation Association, and in his opening address declared that Earl Carrington was one of the best friends of Labour, and a democratic member of the House of Lords. The workers of Woolwich were under more than an ordinary obligation to his lordship. If every lord who possessed land as Lord Carrington did were as good and kindly as he it would be an excellent thing for the country.

* * *

So that apparently, in Crooks' view, landlordism is all right if the landlords are good and kindly, and no objection may be raised to the House of Lords provided the members are "democrats" and will condescend to place the workers under more than an ordinary obligation by opening bazaars for them!

* * *

Of course his lordship was smart enough to rise to the occasion and to play the game. He returned his most grateful thanks for having been allowed to open the bazaar, which he believed was entirely run and entirely stocked by the free gifts of that great industrial class which it was his pride and his privilege to remember his own family originally sprung from. It is rumoured that he added "and have lived on ever since and will continue to do as long as you will allow us" but the loud and prolonged applause, ably led by Mr. Crooks, prevented this from being heard by the assembled sturdy sons of labour.

* * *

Since the bazaar Crooks has been the chief speaker at a Free Trade meeting at Stratford Town Hall, where the chair was taken by C. F. G. Masterman, who was such a *persona grata* with some S.D.F. members when he recently contested Dulwich that they canvassed for him. He is at present the Liberal candidate for North West Ham. The Liberal wirepullers, with their usual astuteness, are trotting him round the constituency in a "non-political" capacity. A few days previous to this meeting he took part in an Education conference and lectured to the members of Grove Congregational Church Literary Society. Doubtless he will shortly be present at the annual distribution of the Coal and Clothing Club, send his best wishes to the annual sale of work of the Dorcas Society, and look in for a few moments at the concert of the amalgamated athletic clubs of the district, for thus are elections fought and won.

* * *

At the Free Trade meeting Councillor Anarchist Leggatt occupied a seat on the platform, together with A. E. Jacobs (I.L.P.), and letters were read from W. Thorne (Labour Candidate for South West Ham) and C. Boardman (Liberal and Passive Resister), regretting their inability to take part in the meeting. Truly a strange gathering! After the speeches Crooks proposed a resolution pledging those present at the meeting to oppose any candidate at the next election who does not guarantee to maintain the policy of Free Trade. Now, if such candidates are to be opposed, their opponents, provided that they pledge themselves to maintain the policy of Free Trade, must be supported. Thus the Liberals adroitly lead Labour members and candidates to admit that there is a difference between capitalist candidates—a difference in favor of Free Traders as against Protectionists, a difference in favour of the kites as against the crows. It is regrettable that members of the S.D.F. and the I.L.P. fall so easily into this trap.

* * *

In the September quarter's report of the Gasworkers' and General Labourers' Union, W. Thorne hopes that when the general election takes place Union members in all parts of the country will recognise the absolute necessity of working for and voting in favour of men of their own class. That way lies disaster! From a Socialist point of view the fact that a candidate is or has been a member of the working-class is not of itself sufficient. Nothing is to be gained by voting for a candidate, whatever his class, who does not understand the principles of Socialism, and who is not prepared to go to the House of Commons as a rebel, determined, by every means in his power, to seek the overthrow of the capitalist-class. The average labour leader who attaches himself to a section of the capitalist political party serves the interests of that party and not those of the working-class.

* * *

Socialists well understand the motives that prompt benevolent plutocrats to build model villages, erect sanitary and even palatial factories and workshops, admit their employees to a share of the profits, and other little dodges of a similar character. It is because they are sufficiently far-sighted to recognise that it pays. The latest is the introduction by Messrs. J. Lyons & Co., of the gramophone. This is now kept going whilst the workers grind coffee, pack tea, etc. A representative of the firm thinks that instead of detracting the girls from their work it gives them a fillip. Soldiers, he says, march better to music, so why should not workers work better?

* * *

There is every reason why the necessary labour should be performed under healthy and enjoyable conditions, but such are at present adopted only to enable the capitalist class to obtain greater results in a given time out of the workers.

* * *

W. C. Steadman, who is advertised in the "Finsbury Free Press" as the "adopted Liberal, Radical and Labour Candidate for Central Finsbury," pursues the even tenor of his way and plays his part exceedingly well as a decoy-duck for the Liberals. Last month he presided at a meeting held at Stepney Meeting House to hear an address from Mr. Durham Stokes, the Liberal Candidate. On the platform were Earl Beauchamp, B. S. Strauss, Liberal candidate for Mile End, and J. W. Benn, Liberal candidate for St. Georges. We would ask our friends who urge the workers to vote for men of their own class, without insisting that they shall be Socialists, whether they consider that Steadman is acting as a friend of his class whilst he is playing the game of the capitalists in this manner?

* * *

An arbitration case has just been concluded between the Liverpool Corporation and Sunlight Soap Lever. Some years ago Mr. Lever purchased 2,200 acres of land at Horwich, adjacent to the Rivington Watershed, the property of the Liverpool Corporation, for £60,000. Mr. Lever gave 400 acres of the land to Bolton, his native place, for a public park, and for the remainder, which the Liverpool Corporation require for public works, he demanded £400,000. The Corporation offered to pay £40,000. Mr. Lever displayed his "public spirit" by refusing and putting Liverpool Ratepayers to the expense of an arbitration, as the result of which the price fixed to be paid to him is £138,449. In this manner our "model employer" builds up his reputation for good works, and by his own hard work (?) becomes enriched. For of such is the kingdom of capitalism. J. Kay.

The Great Public Schools of England.

—:o:—

It should be mentioned at the outset that by the "Great Public Schools" are meant those open only to the members of the Public who have long purses or long pedigrees. They are institutions peculiar to England, where the sons of the propertied-class are taught to play games well, and to despise both healthy labour and those who are foolish enough to provide them with free education and free maintenance, while refusing to claim the same for their own children. For centuries past it has been the aim of all members of the capitalist-class to obtain places for their sons at Eton, Harrow, Rugby, Winchester, or any other great public school, the mere mention of which is to stamp the youths as "gentlemen." The majority of our "famous statesmen" have been educated at these "theatres of athletic manners and training places of a gallant, generous spirit"; and it is in these pleasant places that our rulers and owners have acquired that "education" which is so powerful a factor in fostering class prejudice. It will therefore be interesting to learn for what purpose they were founded.

In the 14th century, William Wykeham, the son of a small farmer, founded the first English Public School at Winchester; the Statutes declare that his purpose was to establish a school where a liberal education might be given to those who desired it but who were unable to pay the cost; they were to be *pauperes et indigentes* (poor and needy), and they were to be "clothed, boarded, lodged, and taught entirely free of cost"; further, 70 Fellowships at New College, Oxford, were to be reserved for them. The number of well-to-do scholars, paying full fees, was limited to 10! Well, in 1873 the "poor and needy" were being charged £60 a year, while 150 scholars were paying full fees.

The world-renowned Eton College was founded in the 15th century by Henry VI. The scholars, who were to be "*pauperes et indigentes*, apt for study and of good morals," were entitled to board and lodging, clothing and education, free of charge! It is needless to say that only the wealthy can afford or dare to send their sons to Eton, and the founder would find it difficult to recognise his carefully formed, constituted, and endowed school in the present famous "patrician seminary." For high-class snobbery an Etonian easily beats all records, and those of some of the other public schools are hard to beat.

In 1512, Thomas Sutton was given permission to found the Charterhouse School for the free education and maintenance of poor children. The air of London proving unwholesome, the "poor children" now resort to Godalming, where plenty of good food and healthy exercise help to form those fine, strapping fellows that form such a contrast to the stunted growth of the slum dweller.

In 1567 L. Sherriff started a free school at Rugby, chiefly for Rugby boys.

In 1571, John Lyon, a yeoman, formed a school at Harrow for the "perpetual education of the poor children of the parish of Harrow, without any charge for the same." Harrow School, second only to Eton!

The Merchant Taylors' School was founded in 1560 for the free education of 250 boys, who alone should be eligible for some 50 Scholarships and Fellowships at St. John's College, Oxford.

In Edward VI.'s reign many free schools were started, including Shrewsbury School, and Christ's Hospital in London for the sons of the "very poor." Christ's Hospital, indeed, has long been of advantage to the hard-worked city clerk and the ill-paid curate, but with its removal to Horsham, it will doubtless soon become, like Charterhouse, a place where the working-class will give free education and free maintenance to the sons of the wealthy.

St. Paul's School was founded by the great Dean Colet, who ordained that it should be free to "153 children of all nations and countries."

At Westminster School it was placed on the statutes that 40 scholars were to be educated free and freely boarded at the expense of the Dean and Chapter.

Dulwich College was founded by Edward Alleyn for the "free education of poor boys."

Perhaps these notes on the charters of eleven of the most famous public schools will suffice to indicate the purpose for which they were founded and how that purpose was fulfilled; of course there are many others whose origin and development were the same.

Although as long ago as 1865 the annual revenues of only four of these schools amounted to £74,000, gratuitous education is now practically non-existent; there are indeed at all the above institutions various scholarships, that often considerably reduce the fees, which vary from £80 to £150, but they are only to be gained by those who already have the qualifications of birth, influence, and education.

Among the boys, wealth and aptness for games are of primary importance, and those "apt for study and of good morals" have to endure the "ragging," so popular, too, at the Universities. It is incredible what suffering has to be endured by those who come to school to work or who refuse to join in the immoral practices so prevalent. The weak are oppressed, and the poor are treated with such contempt that they often run into debt to escape the stigma of poverty. Sham patriotism runs riot, and the daily attendance at chapel engenders that sham religion which is seldom believed in but which proves of service in keeping in its place the working-class. The ignorance of the average public school boy is astounding, and well accounts for the mismanagement of the late South African War, and in a degree, for the decline of British industry. Literature, too, may well become degraded when the leisured classes can hardly write half-a-dozen lines in correct English.

The Rev. R. J. Campbell has denounced the working-class in a way that has even called forth remonstrances from most of the capitalist papers; no one, however, who knows anything of the "Great Public Schools" will deny that the boys, as a rule, are "lazy, unthrifty, improvident, immoral, foul-mouthed, and untruthful and sometimes drunken." "Betting and gambling" and "idle self-indulgence" are almost as prevalent in some public schools as in Park Lane.

This is the way in which the commands of the founders have been obeyed, and it is for this that the poor and needy have been so disgracefully robbed. The history of the "Great Public Schools" is symbolical of the history of the world; the good things produced by and belonging to the working-class, stolen from them and devoted to luxury and riotous waste. It is to put an end to all this that The Socialist Party has been formed, and there is only one method by which the working-class may recover its possessions from the capitalist-class, and that is—Expropriation.—SYDNEY CHASE.

THE bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his "natural superiors," and has left remaining no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous "cash payment." It has drowned the most heavenly ecstacies of religious fervour, of chivalrous enthusiasm, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of egotistical calculation. It has resolved personal worth into exchange value, and in place of the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms, has set up that single, unconscionable freedom—*Free Trade*. In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation.—THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO.

IN conversation with the directing officials of the Church Army, at its headquarters last Monday a representative of the "Morning Advertiser" learnt that the exceptional distress now prevailing had very greatly increased the stress of work which the organisation has normally to bear at the present season of the year. During the month of October the applicants at headquarters for help exceeded by 61 per cent. the total of those who similarly applied in the corresponding month of 1903. It is noticeable, also, the representative was told, that many of these destitute persons come from a superior class.

Socialism and Individualism.

The polemics of reaction let themselves up as the defenders of Individualism.

According to them Socialism will be the *sacrificing* of the individual to Society.

Is there any foundation for such statement? None.

Socialism is not an obstacle to the physical, intellectual, or moral development of man.

On the contrary, it is to-day the only social order capable of assuring the preservation of the individual.

Not only is capitalism the opponent of Individualism but it is its most redoubtable enemy.

Bourgeois society has sacrificed the living to the dead, the productive majority to the parasitical minority. It has made man a slave to the Rich. It has turned against the individual all the forces that have been forged to conquer Nature.

The individual has nothing to hope for, but everything to fear from a continuation of Capitalism.

The exploitation of man by man, of which the defenders of capitalism demand the continuance, is a powerful factor of organic degeneracy.

Denial is impossible.

Under capitalism man loses his means of action and development.

The iniquitous social system deprives him of the most primitive rights, refuses his the means of wealth production, the products of his hand and brain, condemns him to live in slavery, poverty, and ignorance.

Under this régime man weakens, deforms, and wastes.

The degeneration of the people, submissive to capitalism, is not controvertible.

It is proved—we have established it elsewhere—by a decrease in height, weight, muscular force, fertility, sight, hearing, smell, memory, etc., and by an increase of professional maladies, bodily deformities, accidents, lunatics, etc.

The cause of those evils is known, it is the exploitation of man by man.

The interest of the individual demands the abolition of social inequalities, the microbe of all degeneracy.

Socialism demands:

The integral development of man, physically, intellectually, and morally, the free growth of the individual.

Scientific Individualism—Individualism in its highest essence—is SOCIALISM.

Let us prepare its triumph.

From the French of DÉSIRÉ DESCAMPS.
by A. W. PEARSON.

HE that is down needs fear no fall.
PILGRIM'S PROGRESS.

* * *

Better to hunt in fields for health unbought,
Than fee a doctor for a nauseous draught.
DRYDEN.

* * *

This mournful truth is everywhere confessed,
Slow rises worth by poverty depressed.
DR. JOHNSON.

* * *

"Master, I marvel how the fishes live in the sea;"
"Why as men do a-land: the great ones eat up the little ones."—SHAKESPEARE.

* * *

THE law is a sort of hocus-pocus science, that smiles in your face while it picks your pocket; and the glorious uncertainty of it is of more use to the professors than the justice of it.
MACKLIN.

* * *

I never could believe that Providence had sent a few men into the world, ready booted and spurred to ride, and millions ready saddled and bridled to be ridden."
RICHARD RUMBOLD, when on the Scaffold (1685).

* * *

THE Co-operative movement has to some extent lost sight of the great aim which Robert Owen had in view, which was to raise the whole of the members of the community by reorganising the forces and circumstances which governed their lives.—CO-OPERATIVE ANNUAL, 1902.

Correspondence.

—:o:—

(TO THE EDITORS.)

Our comrade Hawkins forwards a copy of the following letter which he has received:

"Draviel, 15.11.04.

"Dear Comrade,—I have just received No. 3 of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, containing your interview, and I am glad to find that you have given a very full and faithful account thereof.

"Trusting that the paper will be successful, and with my best thanks and our kind regards to Mrs. Hawkins and yourself,

"Yours fraternally

"PAUL LAFARGUE."

12, Shelgate Road,
Clapham Junc., S.W.
14.11.04.

Dear Comrades,—Just a few lines of congratulation. I am glad to see that a straight, uncompromising Socialist party has at last entered the political field. If ever there were need of such a party it is at the present time. When one looks around and sees the so-called Socialist parties wobbling about, advising the workers to do one thing one moment and the opposite the next, it is no wonder that the workers are in a chaotic state. It is no wonder that they are apathetic. Therefore, when almost at the last moment as it seems, a straight party springs into existence, I cannot but feel that every success should meet its progress. I think that if you continue as you have begun, the workers will wake up from their apathetic mood and support you wherever you lead. I am heartily pleased with THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, and wish it every success. I, at any rate, will do my best to advertise the paper and forward the Cause.

I remain, yours fraternally,
H. T. DAVEY.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

F. M. (Hamburg).—Your note to hand. Shall be pleased to hear from you further at any time.

C. F. (Kentish Town).—Hardly suitable, but try again.

H. C. (Canning Town).—You are quite mistaken in supposing that we should not welcome the provision of adequate maintenance of all school children. Nothing which we have ever said or written could bear any such construction. What we do believe is that nothing in the shape of *adequate* free maintenance will be given by any section of the capitalist party, and that anything short of *adequate* maintenance is not worth fighting for. When we have the working-class of this country organised on a Socialist basis and as a Socialist political party, we shall deal with all these matters as part of a regular revolutionary programme, but at present we can gain nothing by soliciting reforms and favours from a class against whose material interests it would be to grant them. We shall treat of this matter fully in a subsequent issue.

A.M. (Manchester).—1. We think you will find the matter discussed at length in Giffen's "Essays on Finance." 2. Mulhall covers too short a period. We hope to be able to furnish the figures in some future issue when we have time to work them out.

J. C. T. (Birmingham).—The facts may be as stated but the source is so very unreliable that you cannot quote without some independent evidence. 2. We can afford to display indifference.

J. B. (Plymouth).—We shall consider the matter.

T. R. T. (Newhaven).—Anyone can join The Socialist Party of Great Britain by signing our Declaration of Principles as shewn on page 7. We can send forms to anyone who wishes to join. It is, of course, more interesting to have a Branch in the locality to which you can belong, but failing this, you should belong to the Central organisation pending the formation of a Branch. We shall be pleased to furnish any further information either direct or through our columns.

LITERATURE AGENCY.

Branches and members should purchase their literature through the Party Agent, F. C. Watts, 154, Ashmore Road, Paddington, London, W. Write for particulars as to terms, etc.

CENTRAL ECONOMIC CLASS.

The class meets weekly and is free to all. On application to J. Fitzgerald, 34, Wilmington Square, London, W.C., full particulars will be sent.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

FROM OUR BRANCHES.

Reports from Branches for insertion under this heading MUST *be in* BEFORE *the 20th of each month, otherwise they cannot appear.*

EDMONTON.

Another month of good work well done fitly sums up our position here. Since our last report although three meetings had to be abandoned owing to the rain, nevertheless we have held four meetings in Waltham, four in Edmonton and three in Tottenham. These meetings have been very successful and, as a result, the Edmonton Branch is not only stronger in every way but a sound Branch will soon exist in Tottenham also.

On Sunday, November 20, we had a field-day, the meeting at West Green Rd. lasting nearly four hours, during which five critics—two from the Temperance Party, two from the S.D.F. and one from the Primrose League—had each a turn on the platform. Needless to say the criticism, which was more or less friendly and certainly courteous—in striking contrast to that which greeted us in the evening at Edmonton—was effectively answered, so much so that a resolution thanking The Socialist Party of Great Britain for the addresses delivered and pledging the meeting to work for the realisation of the object of that Party, moved and seconded by two of the audience unknown personally to any of us, was carried unanimously by the meeting. A good sale of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD and an increase of three to our membership were also pleasing features of an all-round good meeting.

In the evening at Angel Road, Edmonton, we proceeded to hold our usual meeting, but before half-an-hour had elapsed the local S.D.F. had planted their platform on the edge of our audience and commenced a series of antics that compelled almost everyone to laugh. We have entirely failed even yet to learn what was the matter with them. They put up Mr. Thomas, Mr. Pearson, and Mr. Mercer, each of whom had two trials to take the attention of the audience from our speaker but in this they absolutely failed; abandoning their platform they tried to break up our meeting by entering the audience and trying to incite a portion of it to riot. In this they failed also and eventually when close upon 10 p.m. the police, as usual, had to make us close our meeting, it fell to the lot of the revolutionary Social-Democratic Federationists to cheer the police and to exhort them to "lock the ——— up." However, the police are not yet the servants of the S.D.F. no matter how anxious one of the latter evidently is to become

the servant of the former.

Still, be those things as they may, the Edmonton Branch of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is in high spirits and full of confidence. We have no desire to bluff ourselves nor yet another body, but the steady sale of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD and the foolish tactics of those who, to suppress an opponent, would jeopardise the right of public meeting by trying to turn orderly meetings into bear-gardens, will yet, and we believe very soon, show effectually that our Party is right, that our Party is justified and alone worth of the confidence of the working-class. Speed the day!—A. ANDERSON.

FULHAM.

THE meetings we have held here have been successful from the numerical standpoint, and the sales of our paper have been fairly good considering the large number of men there are unemployed in this district. The week-night meetings that we hold at Fulham Cross at 8.30 on Wednesdays are better attended than the Sunday morning meetings and have been very successful. Once the summer comes again (as the poet sings) this branch will be placed on on a firmer footing. We are getting well known now and a good number of men are beginning to undertand which is The Socialist Party.

—E. J. B. ALLEN.

ISLINGTON.

With the departure of the last leaves of autumn and the arrival of hoar winter with his chilly blasts comes a falling off in the attendance at our open-air meetings. Too great are the temptations of the cheery inglenook and the fireside's genial glow. No longer do the opening buds of spring, the full-blown flowers of summer, or the many hued leaves of autumn bring the people out to the parks clad in their dainty raiment. No longer the proletariat dons his "Sunday best" to stroll through the thronged avenues——[We have cut out thirteen foolscap pages of similar matter to the above.—EDITORIAL COMMITTEE.]

So we may explain to ourselves the falling off both in the number of our meetings and in the number of the audience at those meetings. We have, however, done something in this direction and shall continue while the weather allows. We are somewhat hampered in our work by the fact that a number of our members are working in enforced overtime. It is not for us to point out the anomaly of such overtime in view of the number of people at present unemployed. Suffice it to say that it is this very unemployment which the capitalist employs as a lever to force men to work excess hours.

Fraternal greetings and a promise of rare doings from the merry village of Islington.

PERCY O'BRIEN MACTAVISH.

PECKHAM.

I AM sorry I was too late for you last month. It was not because there was nothing doing, for, as a matter of fact, things have been very lively in Peckham. The Liberals have been holding open-air meetings which we have attended, and we have asked pertinent questions, which have been talked round. The Liberals allowed opposition, so Comrade Belsey and others put forward our position, and this was well received by the audience. I may say the Liberals were discussing the fiscal policy, and we challenged them to a debate on the subject, but this was not accepted.

We had some handbills printed and distributed at their meeting, announcing a mass meeting of The Socialist Party of Great Britain to take place at the same spot on the following Monday. We wrote Comrades Lehane, Kent, and Anderson, but owing to its turning out such a wet night they did not put in an appearance. It left off raining by the time for starting, and in spite of the weather we had a good meeting, which was adjourned till the following Monday. At the adjourned meeting Anderson turned up and met with such success that we had a third meeting, when Anderson was again the speaker. Our audience was quite as large as that of the Liberals, and Anderson, in spite of the bad weather (all three Mondays were wet), was kept until past 11 o'clock answering questions.

We are still carrying on our outdoor meetings. We had a good meeting at Peckham Rye on Sunday (13th) morning, and we intend having one on Sunday next, weather permitting. The branch meetings are well attended, as are also our Friday night discussions. We have also made several new members and altogether are going on satisfactorily.—W. RUSSELL.

WOOD GREEN.

SINCE my last report of the Movement in Wood Green several really good and successful open-air meetings have been held, both from a standpoint of the numbers attending them, and the intelligent interest shown by numerous questions and lively discussion. Perhaps the most important of those meetings was the one held on Oct. 23rd, when there was a debate between C. Horn, of New Southgate, and comrade A. Anderson, of Edmonton.

The debate arose out of a previous meeting at which C. Horn was present, and at which the speaker, Anderson, referred very plainly to the conduct of C. Horn (who claims to be a Socialist and is a late member of the S.D.F.) in actively supporting a Liberal capitalist candidate for parliamentary honours, thus betraying the working class. Now the two men meet, the one to defend opportunism, the other for uncompromising revolutionary Socialism. It was a sight never to be forgotten to see the great mass of faces turned towards the speakers, eager to take in the whole argument, and anxious to show their appreciation of the many good points.

Comrade Anderson was never in better form, and never before have the workers heard in such plain language the principles of Socialism. This evidently told, not only upon the audience, but upon Horn himself, for his last words were "It is quite true the emancipation of the workers must be the work of the working-class themselves."

At the conclusion of the debate the meeting did not break up, but nearly the whole of the audience remained to listen to another address. The meeting commenced at 11 o'c. and closed at 2.30.

Another feature in Wood Green is that THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is going well, many people asking for the first and second numbers.

—JOHN CRUMP.

THE first care of the Italian Socialists on obtaining control of the administration of the city Reggi-Emelia has been to adopt the following series of commandments for use in the public schools, to impress the children with the ethics of citizenship and the religion of humanity:

"Love thy schoolmates, for they will be thy co-workers for life.

"Love knowledge—the bread of intellect: cherish the same gratitude toward thy teacher as toward thy father and mother.

"Make every day thou livest the occasion for some good and beneficial deed; always sow the seeds of kindness.

"Honour good men and true women; esteem all men as equals; bend thy knees to no one.

"Bear hatred to none, and insult none; the word 'revenge' shall be excluded from the vocabulary; but stand up for thy rights and resist oppression.

"Do not be a coward; stand by the weak and respect and love justice."—*Eastern Herald.*

SUPPORT THE SOCIALIST PARTY

and benefit yourself by purchasing your goods at

The Stores, 127, York Rd., Battersea.

5 per cent given to purchasers and 5 per cent of profits given to Branches. Trading vouchers can be obtained of Secretary, Battersea Branch.

All Goods at Store Prices.

Branch Secretaries and others

SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., T.U. Printers, Wingfield Rd., Stratford.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

CENTRAL OFFICE.

COMMUNIST CLUB,
107, CHARLOTTE ST., LONDON, W.

General Secretary - - C. LEHANE.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

CENTRAL.—Business transacted every Saturday at the Communist Club, 107, Charlotte Street, Fitzroy Square, London, W. Membership in the Central Branch can be obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL.—Kate Hawkins, sec., 47, Wilmington Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 34, Wilmington Square, W.C.

EAST LONDON (Central).—W. Woodhouse, Sec., 95, Kirbey St., Poplar, E. Branch meets every Friday at the address given.

EDMONTON.—R. Kenny, Secretary, 35, Vernon Rd., Tottenham, N. Business meetings at 24, Belmont Avenue, Lower Edmonton, every Friday at 8 p.m.

FULHAM.—E. J. B. Allen, Secretary, 49, Mablethorpe Rd., Fulham Cross, S.W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m.

ISLINGTON.—J. McNicol, Secretary, 179, Isledon Rd., Finsbury Park, N. Branch meets every 2nd and 4th Tuesday of the month at 8.30 p.m. at the "Hope Coffee Tavern," 112, Fonthill Road, Finsbury Park, N.

PADDINGTON.—F. C. Watts, Sec., 154, Ashmore Road, Paddington, W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m., at 33, High St., Peckham, S.E.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—J. Kent, secretary, 5, Rutland Road, Ilford. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Tuesdays in each month at 8.30 at secretary's address.

SOUTHWARK.—S. Eden, Secretary, 62, Penrose St., Walworth. Branch meets every Friday at 8.30 p.m., at the Café, Walworth.

TOOTING.—C. Goss, Secretary, 73, Balham Grove, Balham, S.W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at 61, Glasford Street, Tooting.

WATFORD.—D. R. Newlands, Secretary, 5, Highfield Rd., Bushey, Herts. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m., 73, Harwoods Rd., Watford. Economic Class every Sunday at 3 p.m.

WEST HAM.—G. J. Hollson, Secretary, 'Kelmscott,' Sidney Road, Forest Gate, E. Branch meets every alternate Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. at the address given.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 10, Stanley Villas, Westbury Avenue, Wood Green, N. Branch meets every Thursday at 8.30 p.m.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

BATTERSEA BRANCH.

SYDNEY HALL,

36, YORK RD.,

BATTERSEA, S.W.

A GRAND

New Year Social & Dance

WILL BE HELD AT ABOVE HALL ON

JANUARY 1st, 1905, at 5 p.m.

Short Addresses will be delivered during the Evening.

Admission - - - Sixpence.

All are Welcome.

Printed by Jacomb Bros., 24, Wingfield Road, Stratford, E. for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published by C. Lehane, Gen. Secretary, 107, Charlotte St., W.